

THE LIBERAL CHRISTIAN.

PUBLISHED ONCE A FORTNIGHT.

PRICE ONE DOLLAR, IN ADVANCE.

"GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST, AND ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD WILL TOWARDS MEN."—LUKE 11. 14.

VOL. I.]

BROOKLYN, (CONN.) AUGUST 30, 1823.

[No. 15.]

FROM THE LIBERAL RECORDER.

Heb. i. 8—"Unto the Son he saith, thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." In the next verse it appears that the throne was his by the anointing of the father; "therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Fellows are equals; and if Jesus were the eternal God, he could have no equals except the spirit and the father. No one will pretend that his anointing placed him above them. His throne was received from that being of whom he said to his disciples, I go unto my father and your father, to my God and your God.

1 John iii. 16—"Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." It will be seen upon examination, that the words 'of God' are printed in *Italics*, as an addition of the English translators, and are of course no part of the Bible. The same is true of the word *God*, in Acts vii. 59, in the account of the murder of Stephen.

1 John v. 7—"There are three that bear record in heaven; the father, the word, and the holy ghost; and these three are one."—This, together with John x. 30, may be compared with John xvii. 21, "Holy father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are one;" and John xvii. 21, "As thou father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us:" which would go just as far to prove the disciples the same with the father. Compare this text also with 1 Cor. iii. 8, "He that planteth and he that watereth, are one." No one infers from this, that Paul and Apollos were the same person. We may also compare 1 Tim. ii. 5, "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

1 John v. 20—"We know that the son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." This is the peculiar construction of the writer:—thus, 2 John i. 7, "For many deceivers are entered into the

world which confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." The same rule of grammatical construction, which would make Jesus the true God in the former verse, would make him in this a deceiver and an antichrist.

CERTAIN FACTS.

The generality of Christians, we suspect, are not apprised of the alterations in scripture, which have been made in former ages to support the trinitarian hypothesis. Many orthodox preachers, we fear, keep back certain facts upon this subject, which ought to be made known. We shall state a few and freely offer our pages to any one who will fairly disprove our statements.

1. The first notorious interpolation is the seventh verse of the fifth chapter of the first Epistle of John. We have given a summary of the evidence that this passage is spurious, on the 67th page of the *Liberal Christian*; to that we refer our readers. If any wish to pursue the inquiry respecting this passage, they may obtain great information from a tract by Sir Isaac Newton, entitled "An historical account of two notable corruptions of Scripture in a letter to a friend." Or from Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament, translated by Dr. H. Marsh, pages 417 and 435. Or from the writings of Dr. Adams Clarke, whose commentary is about being reprinted in New-York. The Rev. Henry Ware, of Boston, published in 1820 a pamphlet, entitled "Two letters on the genuineness of the verse 1 John, v. 7. and on the Scriptural Argument for Unitarianism; addressed to the Rev. Alexander M'Leod D. D. of New York." In this will be found the opinions of many most eminent biblical critics, both trinitarian and unitarian. We wish all who have not, would read the whole of this pamphlet attentively.

2. In the same Epistle, 1 John iii. Chap. 16 verse there is in our common translation, a

This tract will soon be put within the reach of all readers, as it is among those proposed to be published by Rev. JARED SPARKS, in his "Collection of Essays, &c." a work which we have recommended (page 40) and again most earnestly recommend.

no other interpolation. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." What humble reader of the New Testament, would suspect that there are no such words as *of God* in the original? Yet such is the fact.

3. Acts. vii. Chap. 59 verse. "And they stoned Stephen, *calling upon God*, and saying Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." This verse by a forced translation is made to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity. We say by a forced translation, because the original word here rendered *calling upon God*, properly means invoking, exclaiming, crying out.—It may more correctly be translated thus, "And they stoned Stephen, crying out and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit."

4. Acts xx. 23. "Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood."—Were this reading genuine, it would go far to establish the idea that the immortal God could die; but there is little doubt that the text has been, in this place, corrupted. Instead of *Theou* (God) it was originally written *Kuriou* (Lord.) Griesbach, who is by all allowed to have investigated the original reading of the New Testament with greater fidelity and success than any one, without hesitation rejects *Theou* (God) and reads *Tou Kuriou* (the Lord); and says, that on the evidence for the latter reading he could not do otherwise. "Ten Manuscripts, of which four are ancient, read *Kuriou*, (Lord.) These Manuscripts are of the highest antiquity & authority and of different families. All the readings in which these Manuscripts agree, are, by the best critics admitted as genuine, and this reading is supported by the most approved ancient versions and ecclesiastical authorities."

Other instances might be mentioned, in which it is very probable the text has been corrupted; and as they are now alleged in support of the trinitarian doctrine, there is too much reason to believe they were altered for that purpose.

CAUSE OF THE FREQUENT REFERENCES TO THE MOSAIC LAW AND RITUAL IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The special occasion of St. Paul's inditing this epistle, and the persons to whom it was sent, and their situation, will unfold the reason of that continual reference to the Mosaic institution, which we meet with in this epistle, more than in any other of his writings.

Addressing himself then as is generally ac-

knowledgeed to Hebrew christians, residing in Judea, in dangerous times, just before the breaking out of their fatal war against the Romans, when they were under many temptations to desert the gospel, his chief design is to confirm them in their adherence to it.—And the argument most likely to turn them back to Judaism being this, that the gospel tended to abolish their divine religion, their priesthood and sacrifices, without giving them an equivalent in lieu of it, this eminent teacher makes it his business to shew the superiority of Christ in character and office to Moses; and even to angels, by whose instrumentality they supposed their law to have been given; and he teaches at large by comparison, that Christ was a better high priest than any under their law, and his death or sacrifice, more efficacious and acceptable to God, than their legal sacrifices.

Not that Christ was properly a priest, or his death properly a sacrifice; but our apostle, a Jew writing to Jews, speaks to them in their own way in terms of allusion to their old religion and its ceremonies; and he intended to signify this only by it, that whatever advantages they supposed that they had from their high priests and sacrifices, Christians derived far more and greater from Christ.

Lindsey's Address to the Students, &c.

IF JESUS CHRIST IS GOD, HE CANNOT BE THE SON OF GOD.

By the deity of Jesus Christ, its advocates mean that he is truly and properly God; not merely a God by office, as Moses and other messengers of Jehovah were; but God by nature; the self-existent, supreme and eternal God. At the same time they acknowledge that there is and can be but one God. It follows, according to their hypothesis, that Jesus Christ is the one and only God, and that there can be no God besides him; for if there be any other God, he is not the only true God, and unless he be the only true God he is not God at all; for they admit that there is but one God; but if he be the one and only God, how is it possible he should be the Son of God? Is it possible that he should be the son of God, and yet be himself that God whose son he is? It is impossible to conceive of a Father and a Son without conceiving of two beings; for no being can be his own Father and a Son to himself. The person who is a Son cannot be the same being whose

son he is. A Father must necessarily be a distinct being from him who is his Son, as well as a Son a distinct being from him who is his Father. To say that God and Christ are one and the same being, is to preclude the relation of Father and Son, which subsists between them; and if it be admitted that they are two beings, it must follow, either that but one of them is God, or that there are two Gods. On the ground of the deity of Christ, it must either be admitted that he is his own Father, and his own Son, and that God is a Father to himself and a Son to himself, which seems too great an absurdity for any reasonable person to admit, or it will follow that he cannot be the Son of God; for how can he be the only true God, and the Son of the only true God, without being both a Father and a Son to himself?

The advocates for the deity of Christ are required to show, how he can be the only true God, and yet have himself a God and Father; how he can be the beloved Son of God, and yet he himself God; while it is admitted there is but one God. Their hypothesis seems to involve them in insuperable difficulty, if they attempt to make one part of their system consistent with the other; as it is clogged with evident self contradiction.—That there is more than one God they dare not admit; for this would be contrary to the most plain and positive declarations of scripture; that Jesus is the Son of God they dare not deny; as to do this would be to deny what is positively asserted in the gospel; to say he is his own Father and a Son to himself, is too grossly absurd; to say it is a mystery will not do; for we can understand it sufficiently to perceive that it involves manifest contradictions. They have sometimes charged us with denying the Son of God, though we have always steadily maintained that Jesus is the Son of God; we might retort the charge upon them, as the doctrine for which they zealously contend, involves a virtual denial of his Sonship. However, we only charge them with maintaining a doctrine, which if followed out consistently, would destroy the Sonship of Christ. *Wright's Tracts.*

The deity of Christ subversive of his Mediation.

A mediator is a third person, acting between opposite parties. He must necessarily be a distinct being from both the parties between whom he acts as mediator. This I suppose will be admitted as incontrovertible:

it follows, that the mediator between God and men must be a being as distinct from God as he is from all other men. This is essentially necessary in order to his acting as mediator: consequently, if Jesus Christ be one of the parties, if he be himself God, it seems impossible that he should be the mediator between God and men.

To say that Jesus Christ is God, and yet that he is the mediator between God and men, is equal to saying, that God is the mediator between God and men, and that Christ is the mediator between himself and men. If Christ be God, and be the mediator, it is undeniable that the mediator must be God.—Again, if Christ be both God and the mediator between God and men, it is an unavoidable consequence, that he is the mediator between himself and men. I see not how these consequences of the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ can be avoided; and surely their absurdity must strike every candid impartial person.—The scriptures nowhere intimate that God is the mediator between God and men, or that Christ is the mediator between himself and men; nor will the advocates for his deity venture to assert that this is the case; they will not dare to adopt language plainly expressive of what is so glaringly absurd; yet, it is evident, that, so long as they maintain the deity of Jesus Christ, they must either allow the truth of what such language expresses, or give up the doctrine of his mediation.—They are required to show, if Christ be God, who is the mediator between God and men; as the mediator must be a person distinct from God. The deity of Jesus Christ, followed out to its natural consequences, would exclude him from the office of mediator, and set aside the whole of the gospel plan of mediation; for if he himself be God, the only God, it seems impossible that he should be a middle person, and act as such, between God and men. As the Sonship and mediation of Jesus Christ are acknowledged by all Christians to be plainly taught in the New Testament, and the doctrine of his deity is incompatible with his Sonship and Mediation; it follows, that the doctrine of his deity must be false, and cannot be retained without manifest inconsistency. *Ibid.*

—
“WHILE we wrangle here in the dark, we are dying, and passing to the world, that will decide all our controversies; and the safest passage thither is by peaceable holiness.”

THE EXTENT OF THE REFORMATION IN THE
16TH CENTURY.

That the subject may be the more clearly presented to your minds, I will prosecute the inquiry into the extent of the reformation, under three distinct branches.

1. The power exercised in the government of ecclesiastical affairs.

2. The ceremonies and exercises to be adopted in the public worship of God. And

3. The doctrines that were inculcated and established as the essential truths of revelation.

It is not necessary to remark, that the reformers denied the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. They denied that Popes and general councils were either infallible or supreme judges in concerns of religion; they declared the scriptures to be the sole law of Christians; and they submitted its interpretation to the enlightened conscience and sound judgement of each individual disciple. The grand principle, the permanent foundation of the reformed religion, is the sufficiency of scripture as a rule of faith and practice, and the right of private judgement in matters of religion.—To the support of the sufficiency of scripture, and the right of private judgement, Luther devoted, his talents, his reputation, and his life. The truth of these positions he proved by arguments, which all his adversaries could neither confute nor invalidate. This proof remains in its full force, though the practice of the first reformers and of most of their successors has been quite inconsistent with the principle. By it Luther has transmitted an imperishable reputation. The sufficiency of scripture, and the right of private judgement, is the very soul of protestantism.—These principles have, at least in theory, been admitted by all denominations of protestants through every century since the days of Luther; and as long as these are admitted even as speculative truths, Christian liberty, at least in its root, will have vitality. The ambition of civil rulers may, in one country, smother its growth; and in another the contention of different denominations of professors for superiority and dominion, may destroy its shoots; but it will still retain life, and as prejudices are conquered, in the progress of general improvement, it will grow to its full strength, put forth its rich foliage, and yield its divine fruit.

But with sorrow and pain we review the weakness and inconsistency of man, in this

most sacred transaction. Luther, and all the other reformers, denied absolutely that any human power might authoritatively settle the articles of Christian faith: they separated themselves from the existing Hierarchy, and claimed the liberty to form their own system of faith, and to establish their own forms of worship; and at the same time they quarrelled with each other about its exercise, and denied it to all who opposed their systems. They individually were disposed to exercise dominion over the faith of their fellow disciples, and to Lord it over the heritage of God. The power to prescribe articles of faith which they arrested in the hands of the Roman pontiff, they assumed themselves; and the authority which they denied to civil government to enforce the decrees of the Pope among Catholic nations, they transferred to the civil governments in protestant countries, and required them by penal statutes to enforce their own creeds and formularies.

At that age, Christian liberty was not understood by any class of men, and religious toleration was no where allowed. The creed and confession of Luther were established by the civil authority of all the German princes who adopted his system.—Wherever the Lutheran religion was received, these creeds and confessions were made the laws of the land, and opposition to them was punished as crimes committed against the state. Similar remarks will apply to other reformers. Their articles of faith and their plans of Church government were adopted and supported by civil authority.—By the power of the civil magistrate, Calvin burnt Servetus, at Geneva, for heresy.

The reformation in England, as it respects power, was merely nominal. Henry VIII. assumed the ecclesiastical sceptre, which he tore from the sovereign pontiff. His supremacy in religion was supported by acts of parliament, and the nature of his ecclesiastical government may be understood by the following six articles, which were formally enacted and kept in force during his reign. I will adopt the language of the historian:—

“The king being sensible of the good of union, and the mischief of discord in points of religion, had come to the parliament in person, and had opened many things of high learning there; and that with the consent of both houses, he sent forth these articles.

1. That in the sacrament there was no substance of the bread and wine, but only the natural body and blood of Christ.

2. That Christ was entirely in each kind, and so communion in both was not necessary.

3. That priests, by the law of God, ought not to marry.

4. That vows of chastity taken after the age of twenty-one, ought to be kept.

5. That private masses were lawful and useful.

6. That auricular confession was necessary, and ought to be retained.

These articles were thus solemnly proclaimed as essential Christian verities. Practical opposition to any of them, persisted in, was made a capital offence, and many were in consequence executed. Even Lambert, a priest of learning, judgement and moral life, was solemnly tried before the king, the nobles, and bishops of the realm for denying the real presence; was condemned and finally burnt. In the reign of Edward VI. the learned, the pious, and good Archbishop Cranmer, under the inveterate prejudice of early education, persuaded that young but humane monarch, to give his sanction to burning a poor woman on a charge of heresy. The pious king in tears, signed the death warrant, and pathetically said to the Archbishop, "Since I resign up myself in this matter to your judgement, if I sin in it, the sin must lie at your door."

In the reign of queen Elizabeth, the English episcopal Church was permanently established. But the Supremacy was still vested in the sovereign; and in the opinion of many learned, judicious, and pious individuals, their forms, in some particulars, bear too near a resemblance to the superstitious rites and corrupt usages of the Church, from which they separated. Indeed it has been pointedly remarked, that in the English communion, we find, "a Papist liturgy, Calvinistic articles of faith, and an Arminian Clergy."

Some of the above observations would, with more propriety, have fallen under the head of doctrines, but I thought it expedient at once to close our remarks on the reformation in England.

Our venerated ancestors, who first settled in America, while they were inhabitants of the mother country, claimed the right to form their faith from an examination of the sacred oracles; and they brought with them the true protestant principles of the sufficiency of scripture and the right of private judgement; but they also, in practice, discovered the inconsistency common to their age. They intimately incorporated Church and state, and denied to all dissentients from their system

the right of conscience. We see then that the reformation, as it respects the liberty of opinion and the rights of conscience, though in theory perfect, in reality was partial and limited.

The reformation of the sixteenth century, as it respected the ceremonies and exercises of public worship, both among Lutherans and Calvinists, was thorough. Luther almost without exception, removed the superstitious rights of the Papal Church. He reduced the number of sacraments to two, viz. baptism and the Lord's supper. He exploded the adoration of the host, auricular confession, purgatory, prayers to departed saints, and the worship of images. He also opposed monastick vows, the fasts of the Romish Church, and indulgences.

The reformers generally introduced public forms of praise and prayer adapted to the intellectual, the spiritual worship of the Deity, and which had a direct tendency to cherish pious affections, and to render men the fit objects of divine favor. They also adopted an improved system of preaching, better calculated to enlighten the human mind, to improve the human heart, and to lead to pure morality in life and conversation.

Caution to avoid Popish errors, has, perhaps, in some instances, particularly among puritans, been carried to an extreme. Thus, that men might not fall into the Papistical practice of praying for the dead, neither prayers nor any religious exercise was customary at funerals. Our ancestors brought this caution, may I not say prejudice, with them into our country; and for more than a century after their settlement here, prayers were not made at funerals. The first prayer made, and the first sermon preached at the obsequies of a deceased person in Boston, were at the funeral of the Rev. Dr. Mayhew, in the year 1766.

Objections have been often made to the congregational worship. It is thought to be too simple. In public worship, we are told that there should be more ornament, more ceremonies to fix the attention, and to excite suitable emotions. But if we are at the opposite extreme of that of the Papists, experience, I think, shows that our extreme is the safest. Splendor of ornament, & redundancy of ceremony have a tendency to engross the mind, and lead people to suppose that religious worship consists in mere external observances.—When the form of worship is simple, the service may be the more intellectual and edify-

ing, and the worship more spiritual and acceptable.

The reformation, as it respects Christian doctrines, will be the subject of our attention on a future occasion.

Dr. Bancroft.

FORGIVENESS AND JUSTIFICATION.

WE would now call the attention of our readers to the meaning of some words used in scripture to designate the method, in which God bestows his favor, for instance, forgiveness and justification.

What first strikes us is the apparent inconsistency between these terms. If forgiveness is the method of God's accepting us, how can it be justification? How can men be justified in sin? or, being sinful as they are, how can they be justified at all? We answer they cannot. The term is used not in a literal, but in a figurative sense. Justification is being *treated as if we were just*; at least in one respect,—in being freed from the just consequences of sin; not perhaps from *all* its consequences, but from what it properly deserves. Justification therefore is the same as forgiveness.

With regard to forgiveness, however, I imagine, we are apt to conceive of it, as some distinct act or declaration of the Almighty, made at some definite period and pledged to the penitent for all future time. But it is rather to be regarded as a disposition in God. It is not an artificial, arbitrary, absolute decree of immunity from all the evils that follow transgression. But it is a disposition to deal mercifully with us. It forgives us not all at once, but in proportion to our amendment.—It can do no more. It cannot approve of sin, nor make it the source of happiness. It is not capricious nor fond; but wise and holy. It reproves, while it encourages; it warns, while it pardons us.

There is another term sometimes used to express the divine method of acceptance, which it is very important to the sense of some passages to understand. It is righteousness; and is particularly used for the purpose now specified in some of the early chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. It means God's gracious method of justification; and like this last term is used in a figurative sense, meaning not literal righteousness, nor making men actually righteous, but treating them as if they were so—i. e. bestowing favour and kindness upon them. D.

THE STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

In several preceeding numbers it has been attempted to assist our readers to a better understanding of the scriptures, by explaining many words and phrases, that most frequently recur in them. We would close with urging upon them the pursuit of religious knowledge by a more faithful study of the Bible. Would it not be better to read less, and to think more? to peruse, perhaps, fewer chapters of our sacred books, and oftener to pause on the verses that compose them, in order to ascertain their exact meaning? To say nothing of the limits of our knowledge, does it not want accuracy? And is not the vagueness and generality of our notions, one reason why they make so little impression upon us? Is not this one great reason why the public services of religion so slightly and so transiently affect us? Does it, can it consist with the sense of a moral creature to have clear perceptions of such a theme as religion, and be indifferent to it? a thousand times more indifferent perhaps than to the merest trifle that floats on this perishing scene of things? I am persuaded it does not. I am persuaded there is a better nature within us, that would assert itself, if we would give it the opportunity. Let any one set himself to meditate concerning duty and sin, concerning God and futurity, and in spite of himself he will begin to feel. Let any one perceive—let him think and bring home to his heart the conviction, that God is his original, supreme, only Benefactor, whose instruments and bounties are all creatures and things—let him see in every ray of light, and feel in every breath of air and in every sense of joy within, let him perceive the goodness of God, and his heart must open to the call. It is not possible that he should consider and remember often that he is surrounded with God and with goodness and fail to catch a kindred spirit. If he but vaguely admits that it is so, he may be indifferent as multitudes are. But let him understand what he admits; let him meditate, let him consider; let him learn what the children of sense and of this world never know; let him learn that God is indeed in all the earth, in his power, his wisdom, his love, and nature will rise up in new charms before him, and the path of life will grow fairer to his eye, and heaven and earth will seem to sing for joy.

So too, of the volume of revelation, there is reason to fear that it is seen in doubtful obscurity. We do not clearly and fully understand what we read. If we did, its greatest

realities would not pass as fictions before us. If we did, it would rejoice or it would depress us, and well were it, that it should do one of these. If we did exercise a rational sense and understanding, how impressive would be the record of all our duty and hope and destiny! No instrument, though it proclaimed us Lord of half the perishing treasures of this world, would be so deeply interesting. No title of sovereignty, though it gave us empire over far spreading seas and continents, would be so bright to our eye, as the sacred page that proclaims us heirs of the eternal inheritance and kingdom of heaven. Shall not such a record be the subject of some close and scrutinizing attention? May it not well occupy some of our best moments and of our most earnest and solemn thoughts?

The Ethiopian, baptized by Philip, had travelled a distance of many hundred miles to acquaint himself with the will of God. Shall we give less heed to it, because the volume that declares it is in our own dwellings? He did not disdain to invite the way faring man into his chariot, to instruct him in the scriptures. Shall the numberless facilities, which we have for understanding them, render us less assiduous to learn their import? In fine this noble inquirer, having been thus instructed, went on his way rejoicing. Let us learn, with the same zeal, with the same carefulness, with the same docility, and we may go thus on the way of life; we may go thus to a better country even an heavenly. D.

SCHISMATIC OR HERETIC.

No person, says Dr. Campbell, who in the spirit of candour and charity adheres to that which to the best of his judgement is right, though in this opinion he should be mistaken, is in the scriptural sense either *schismatic* or *heretic*; and he on the contrary, whatever sect he belongs to, is more entitled to those odious appellations, who is most apt to throw the imputation upon others.

ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

Continued from page 12.

THE offices of piety are but a part of our duty. The service of God equally comprehends every personal and social virtue. The second commandment, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, is of like authority and obligation, as the first. We shall be as certainly judged by the precepts which require self knowledge, the cultivation of our understandings, self government and discretion,

humility, industry and contentment, as by that which demands that we should love the Lord our God with all our hearts. The great evidence indeed which God requires of the sincerity of our love of himself, and of all the offices of christian piety, is our obedience to the moral precepts of the gospel. And suppose that each of these precepts exerted on our hearts and conduct, all the authority of divine commands. Not only would there be no envy nor jealousy among us, but every one would feel the prosperity of another to be a proportionate accession to his own happiness. There would be no ungenerous interpretation of each other's motives; no false accusations; no tell-tale gossiping; no slander; and no disposition to sit in judgement on others, and condemn them. In all our intercourse, we should feel the perfect security and confidence of friendship. We should be as ready to do every office of kindness, as we are to desire it. We should as readily and unreservedly forgive, as we hope to be forgiven. There would be no encroachments on neighbors, and no interference in each other's rights. We should feel equal trust in each other's word, as if it were confirmed by all the bonds of law. We should look with confidence, for every aid and accommodation, as if they might be claimed as the most incontestible of rights. Then, too, we should see the ignorant,—not claiming and exerting influence, but,—seeking instruction. Every one would be far more solicitous to know himself, than to obtain the secrets of others. We should have no idlers, wasting their time and abusing their opportunities; and none squandering their property, destroying their health, corrupting their hearts, and bringing want and misery into their families, by intemperance. If then, the precepts of the gospel which enjoin the personal and social virtues, were strongly and universally felt, as the will of God, would they not produce a most striking revival of religion? Embody the piety and virtue of the gospel in an individual. Form as distinct a conception as you can of one, of whom you would say, he is indeed a christian; attend him in his private and his family worship, in all his intercourse with his friends, in his daily labors and transactions of business; observe him in all his personal indulgencies, and in all his conduct as a neighbor; in his disposal of his time, and in the character and tendencies of his conversation; observe at once his temperance and frugality, his benevolence, and incorruptible upright

ness; and go with him to the house of God, and to the table of Christ. What this individual is, should each of us be, if we were christians. And what a change would it produce in the hearts and characters of individuals; in the economy, discipline, and happiness of families; and in our character and our happiness as a christian society! See then what motives we have to pray for a revival of religion!

I have adverted to what I believe to be most essential mistakes concerning religion itself. And out of these mistakes, as I think, have grown equally mistaken conceptions of revivals of religion. Religion has been supposed to be something very distinct from the ordinary duties of life. It has been made mere passion, and often as unsanctified a passion, as any of the world. There have been excitements, called revivals of religion, which have rent families asunder, and made schisms in the church; which have caused the ordinary business of life to be neglected; made parents most negligent of the care of their children; and many of the most important personal and social virtues to be sacrificed to zeal for supposed offices of piety. Many have been persuaded, that they have been brought out of darkness into marvellous light and have become full grown christians, and have experienced an entire change of heart, while their practice has been scarcely otherwise changed, than as they have given up every thing for the external observances of religion. They may be no more industrious, or temperate, or upright than they were before; and may retain the same unsanctified temper and will, by which they were before characterised; and are yet persuaded, that their calling and election are sure. And it is deserving of remark, if you bring before them their vicious dispositions and habits, or ask them for evidence of their strong assurance; they refer you, not to a change of character and life,—not to a progressive virtue and piety—but to *the time when they were converted*. They are sure that they have been born again; and therefore they are sure, that whatever their lives have since been, or now are, they shall not, and cannot finally fail of an inheritance of the promises. I need not say how obvious, and how dangerous is this self delusion. A genuine revival of religion will, indeed, manifest itself in the fidelity, gratitude & pious interest with which all the public and private means of religion will be improved. Every heart would be an altar on which the

fire of devotion would never go out. Every house would be a temple of God, and consecrated to his daily worship. Every Sabbath would be in truth to every one a holy day.—And not one, of an age to judge and choose for himself, would be absent from the table of Christ. But these would not be its only manifestations. It would be equally apparent in our daily temper, conversation and deportment. It would make us zealous in *every good work*. It would make us better husbands and wives, better parents and children, better brothers and sisters, better neighbors and citizens. It would cause us to think modestly of ourselves, and more kindly of others; to deny ourselves, that we might do good to others; to be ready and willing to obey every call of duty, in every relation and circumstance of life. When you see one forsaking his vicious dispositions and habits, and becoming more meek and gentle and forbearing and forgiving; and instead of being profane, pure and reverent of God in all his conversation; converted from idleness to industry, from cunning to ingenuousness, from double dealing to uprightness, and from a busy, meddling temper, and interference with the concerns of others, to caution in his language, and a greater attention to his own affairs; when you see a young man forsaking the haunts of the idle and intemperate, and loving his own fire side; denying his appetites, and providing for his own family; and when you find that he not only daily reads the scriptures, but applies them as the rules of his temper and conduct; when you find he prays in secret and in his family; and, instead of coming to church only occasionally, is always there a devout worshipper, gratefully commemorating the love of the Saviour, and living in conformity to the example, and in obedience to the commands of Christ;—when you see these changes you may be warranted in saying, here is a revival of religion. And great indeed would be the revival, if these changes could be extensively effected.

And in these views, I think it is equally apparent, that the great instrument to be employed is not *fear*, but *love*. Love is the spirit of the first and second commandment; and it is the vital principle of a truly Christian obedience. The fear of God is indeed *the beginning of wisdom*; but if our wisdom ends too in fear, it is not the wisdom of the gospel. God is Love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.

From Christian Disciple.